D 619
.H8
Copy 2

619
H8cp2

D 619
.H8
Copy 2

WENT TO WAR

Submarine Warfare
1. Prussian Militarism

DAVID F. HOUSTON
Secretary of Agriculture

russian militarism should be permitted to dominate, then the
-Saxon fight for free institutions and liberty, persisting from
mede to Yorktown * * * would have been made in vain."

6317

GERMANY'S PLEDGES TO A

No. 1 (July 8, 1915).—"The Imperial
peats the assurances that American ship
hindered in the prosecution of legitimate sh
the lives of American citizens on neutral vesse
not be placed in jeopardy."

No. 2 (September 1, 1915).—"Liners will not be sunk by our submarines without warning and without safety of the lives of non-combatants, provided that the liners do not try to escape or offer resistance."

No. 3 (October 5, 1915).—"The orders issued by His Majesty the Emperor to the commanders of the German submarines * * * have been made so stringent that the recurrence of incidents similar to the Arabic case is considered out of the question."

No. 4 (May 4, 1916).—"In accordance with the general practice of visit and search and destruction of merchant vessels recognized by international law, such vessels, both within and without the area declared as naval war zone, shall not be sunk without warning and without saving human lives, unless these ships attempt to escape or offer resistance."

ALL OF THEM RUTHLESSLY BROKEN.

D. of D.
JUN 19 1918

SUBMARINE WARFARE AND THE PRUSSIAN AUTOCRACY.

WHY IS the United States at war with Germany? Why all this preparation, expense, and jeopardy of thousands of American lives? Are we fighting the battles of England, France, Italy, and Russia? Are we in the war to pull the chestnuts of the Allies out of the fire? Are we fighting to help them recover lost territory or to acquire new possessions? Why do we fight at all? Why not employ peaceful means? Why not negotiate?

These questions are now being asked not infrequently, especially by German propagandists, by a few disloyal natives, and by some unintelligent and unpatriotic pacifists. Such people imagine that the time is opportune. They imagine that many Americans are astounded and resentful over the prospect of enormous expenditures, burdens of taxation, and sacrifice of life. They assume that there is, or will be, a reaction; that the people have short memories. They place reliance on the fact that the scene of conflict is remote, that our people cannot appreciate that a defensive war can be waged by forces at a distance, and that aggressive action may be in the highest degree defensive.

The main answer to these enemies of America within and without is simple. We are at war with Germany primarily to assert and to defend our rights, to make good our claim that we are a free nation, entitled to exercise rights long recognized by all the nations of the world, to exercise these rights without restraint or dictation from the Prussian autocracy and militarists, to have the kind of institutions we wish, and to live the kind of life we have determined to live. We are at war with Germany because Germany made war on us, sank our ships, and killed our citizens who were going about their proper business in places where they had a right to be, traveling as they had a right to travel. We either had to fight or keep our citizens and ships from the seas around

England, France, and Italy, or to have our ships sunk and our people killed.

We did not make this war. Germany made war on America, and only after exercising great patience and enduring grievous wrongs did we formally declare this to be a fact. For over two years Germany had committed hostile acts against our sovereignty, destroying the property and lives of our citizens, acts which if committed by any smaller power or power nearer home would have led to a quick demand from our people for a belligerent response. By turns, as it suited Germany's needs, she was apologetic and contemptuous, conciliatory and dictatorial, full of promises and heedless of them, finally repudiating her most solemn obligations. In the meantime, while we were extending hospitality to her diplomats here and representing her abroad, she was carrying on a hostile propaganda within our own borders as well as abroad, promoting plots to destroy our plants, and attempting to sow dissension among our people. Recall the history of our negotiations with Germany, of our attempts to secure justice by diplomatic, peaceful means.

February 4, 1915, Germany declared that on and after February 18, 1915, she would regard the waters around Great Britain and Ireland, including the Channel, as a war zone and that "every enemy merchant ship would be destroyed without possibility of avoiding danger to crew and passengers." She pointed out that it would not always be possible to prevent neutral vessels from becoming victims of submarine attack. This action was without the color of justification in international law. Her only legitimate course was to declare and to effect a blockade and then, having done so, to intercept enemy vessels, discriminating between enemy and neutral vessels, enemy and neutral cargoes, in the case of neutral ships captured to take to prize courts only those carrying contraband, to sink vessels only in extraordinary circumstances, and in every case to give safety to crews and passengers and to preserve all papers of ships sunk or captured. Because of the Allied fleets, it was impossible for Germany to do these things by the use of instruments heretofore employed. She could attempt them only with a new device—the submarine.

Unquestionably new conditions of war had arisen and new means for waging it had come into existence; and just as it was recognized that fleets could not be held to a close block-

ade of ports, the old three-mile blockade, so it was tacitly admitted that a submarine could not be expected to capture and take a ship into port, but might sink it, provided it practiced visit and search for purposes of discrimination, safeguarded the lives of crew and passengers and therefore gave ample warning to vessels and did not sink them in places or under conditions in which non-combatants could not secure safety. These things, under international law, it was necessary that Germany have her submarine commanders do, or that she set aside international law and make necessity the only law, make law to suit herself and the desperate conditions into which she had brought herself by her own aggressive action.

The justification Germany attempted to give was that England had declined to respect in full the Declaration of London, had extended unnecessarily the list of contraband, had brought unfair pressure on neutrals, had declared the North Sea a seat of war, and was warring not only on the military forces of Germany but on the whole civilian population as well. She ignored the fact that England and her allies had fleets which, by the use of practices recognized by law, could maintain a blockade and which up to this time they have maintained without sinking ships or killing non-combatants. Germany could not do these things and had no right to whine because the Allies could. She is certainly the last nation in the world to demand that only military forces be considered as involved in the war. For centuries Prussia had recognized clearly, more clearly than any other government, that a whole nation makes war, had proceeded early to organize herself on that basis, and had gone out to extend and had repeatedly succeeded in extending her possessions by force against laws of right and morality. Her tender consideration for the civilian population and her view of the extent to which it should be exempted from the pressure and horrors of war are amply illustrated by her dealings in Belgium, Northern France, Poland, Serbia, and on the high seas. Certainly Germany ought to have thought of England's fleet and the possibility of being cut off before she so recklessly embarked in war. She did not establish, and has not yet established, even an approximately effective blockade. She impertinently warned neutrals to keep their citizens off enemy merchant vessels and out of the war zone. Neutral citizens had, and have, a perfect right to travel on unarmed or even defensively armed enemy merchant vessels

and to go where they please on the high seas. To have acceded to such insolent dictation from Germany would have amounted to a waiver of international law and right and to the doing of an unneutral act against the Allies, just as would compliance with the suggestion made by Germany on February 16 and frequently repeated, that neutrals cease to ship arms and munitions to the Allies. Germany knew that neutrals had a perfect right to do this. She herself had exercised the same right more than once. She knew the dealers in this country would have filled munitions orders for her and that it was no fault of ours that she could not secure them. These things, too, she ought to have thought of before she provoked hostilities.

On February 11 this Government replied, contesting Germany's position and warning her that it would hold her to a strict accountability and take every necessary step to safeguard American lives and property and to secure a full enjoyment of their rights on the high seas.

March 12, 1915, the Allies issued a decree in which they declared that it was necessary to prevent merchandise from reaching Germany directly or through neutrals. They, however, asserted in taking this step that they would not follow Germany in her cruel and barbarous methods and would not in their intention endanger neutral vessels or the lives of non-combatants; that they would act in strict conformity with the laws of humanity. On March 28 a German submarine sank the *Falaba,* drowning an American citizen; on May 1 the *Gulflight,* drowning two American citizens; and on May 7 the *Lusitania,* drowning 114.

These acts were followed by a protest from this Government on May 13 in which a demand was made for disavowal of the action of the commander of the submarine in sinking the *Lusitania* and for reparation. This Government informed Germany that it would omit no word or act necessary to the performance of its sacred duty of maintaining the rights of the United States and of its citizens and of safeguarding their free exercise. On May 28 Germany replied, placing the responsibility for the sinking of the *Lusitania* on Great Britain and the British shipping company, asserting that the *Lusitania* was an auxiliary cruiser, which was false; that it was armed, which was equally false; and that the company permitted it to carry munitions, which it had a right to do. On the 1st of June, the German Government asserted that the

attack on the *Gulflight* was an unfortunate accident, that the submarine commander was in no wise to blame, and expressed regret and stated that it would pay damages.

On the 9th of June the Government of the United States replied to Germany's *Lusitania* note, denying the statements, as to the character of the *Lusitania* and as to her armament, asserting that it was sunk without warning, solemnly renewed its representations, and asked assurances that American ships and the lives of American citizens be not put in jeopardy. A month later Germany answered, saying that she was compelled to meet the British blockade, and that if her submarine commander had practiced visit and search the submarine would have been destroyed. She cynically added that in any event it was to have been expected that a mighty ship like the *Lusitania* would remain above the water long enough for its passengers to get off. The sinking of this ship, she hypocritically represented, revealed with horrible clearness to what jeopardy of human lives the manner of conducting war employed by her adversaries led. American ships, she promised, would not be hindered from their legitimate business, and lives on neutral vessels would not be jeopardized. This was promise number one. She decreed that neutral vessels must be properly marked, sufficient notice be given in advance, and a guaranty be furnished that they would not carry contraband. She impudently informed us that she would agree to a proposal to increase by installments the number of vessels available for the passenger service by placing a reasonable number of neutral ships under the American flag. She informed us that American citizens did not need to travel to Europe on enemy vessels and that she was merely following England's example in declaring a part of the high seas an area of war. In her singular psychology, a mere declaration by her was to be given the same regard and weight as an established fact. With her lack of a sense of humor, she apparently could see no difference between an effective blockade maintained by England and a paper blockade announced by her. Accidents suffered by neutrals on enemy ships in such an area could not be judged differently from those suffered in a war zone on land. If this country could not secure a sufficient number of neutral ships, then the German Government would permit it to place four enemy vessels under its flag.

Of course, the Secretary of State answered that Germany's reply was unsatisfactory. It did not indicate how the prin-

ciples of international law and humanity could be applied. It proposed a partial suspension of them, which in effect set them aside. This Government noted Germany's assurance, made once more, as to the freedom of the seas, that the character and cargoes of merchant vessels would be first determined and that lives of non-combatants would not be jeopardized. The United States demanded the disavowal of the act of the commander of the submarine, and reparation for injuries. It renewed the warning to Germany and advised her that the repetition of such an act against the rights of the United States affecting her citizens would be regarded as deliberately unfriendly.

Less than a month after this definite representation, Ambassador Page sent notice from London of the sinking of the *Arabic*, with a loss of three American lives. Five days later the German ambassador expressed the hope that the United States would await full information before acting, and asserted that if American lives were lost it was not in accordance with the intention of the German Government. A week later he gave this assurance: "Liners will not be sunk by our submarines without warning and without safety of non-combatants provided that they do not try to escape or offer resistance." This was promise number two. He added that this policy was decided upon by his government before the *Arabic* was sunk. This was followed, on September 7, by word from the German Government through Ambassador Gerard that the *Arabic* was sunk because it planned to attack the submarine; that the government could not admit indemnity even if the commander was mistaken; and that if he was, the government would be willing to submit the case to The Hague. On the 14th, after receiving the facts, Mr. Lansing wrote that the *Arabic* was not warned and did not try to ram the submarine. On October 5 Bernstorff replied that the German Government rules had been made so stringent that no repetition of the *Arabic* case was possible, admitted the validity of the evidence against the *Arabic's* attempt to ram the submarine, expressed regret at the occurrence, disavowed the act, and offered indemnity. This was promise number three.

On January 7, 1916, the German ambassador gave notice that German submarines in the Mediterranean would destroy any vessels, passenger as well as freight, but only after the safety of passengers and crew had been assured. Three months later Germany reopened the whole subject, rehashing the old

arguments, and, with obvious insincerity, expressed the conviction that the United States would appreciate her point of view. Germany was evidently getting ready to break all her promises.

On March 27 the State Department sent Ambassador Gerard word that there was much evidence that the Channel passenger steamer *Sussex* was sunk by a torpedo March 24 with 328 passengers on board. It asked for information concerning the following ships which, with Americans on board, were sunk: The *Englishman,* the *Manchester Guardian,* the *Eagle Point,* and the *Berwindale,* all sunk within a comparatively short time. The German Government replied on April 11, saying either that it did not have sufficient information to form an opinion or that it was doubtful if the sinking was traceable to a submarine, or that the ship attempted to escape. It asserted that the *Sussex* was not torpedoed, and frivolously represented that the German commander made a sketch of a vessel torpedoed at the time in question and that this sketch did not look like the picture of the *Sussex* in the London Graphic. If, however, the commander was mistaken Germany would be willing to submit the case to The Hague. In other words, she made a false statement about the matter and agreed that if her statement was proven to be false she would arbitrate. Within a week this Government replied that the *Sussex* was torpedoed; that this was not an isolated case; that it was clear Germany had made indiscriminate destruction a deliberate policy, contrary to assurances given again and again; that the United States had been willing to wait till the course of Germany was susceptible of only one interpretation; and that that time had been reached. It added: "Unless the Imperial German Government should now immediately declare in effect an abandonment of its recent methods of submarine warfare against passenger and freight carrying vessels the Government of the United States can have no choice but to sever diplomatic relations with the German Empire altogether." The next day the President addressed the Congress to the same effect.

On May 4 Germany replied that she was alive to the possibility that the *Sussex* was torpedoed, admitting in effect that she was caught in having made a false statement. Her commanders, she asserted, had orders to conduct warfare in accordance with visit and search except in the case of enemy trade with enemy ships in the war zone. As to these she

gave no assurance and claimed that she had never given any. She regretted that the United States did not extend the same sympathy to the German civilian population that it did to the victims of submarine warfare. However, she was willing to go the limit: "In accordance with the principles of law German submarines will exercise visit and search before sinking merchant vessels recognized by law if they do not attempt to escape or resist." This was promise number four. The United States, however, must make England restore the freedom of the seas; that is, make her surrender her naval advantage. If she did not succeed then Germany would be facing a new situation. The United States replied, expressing satisfaction that Germany had abandoned her indiscriminate destruction of merchant vessels and her expectation that there would be a scrupulous execution of the altered policy. She could not even discuss the suggestion that respect by Germany for the rights of the United States should depend on the conduct of any other Government affecting the rights of neutrals. Responsibility in such matters was absolute, not relative.

In the latter part of the year there were rumors that Germany would make suggestions concerning peace. It was suspected that her action would be insincere and would be intended to affect the public sentiment of neutrals, especially that of a portion of the population of the United States. On December 12 the German Chancellor indicated that Germany might be willing to discuss peace. A few days later, the President sent substantially identical notes to the powers, suggesting the desirability of a statement of terms on the basis of which they would be willing to discuss peace. This thought, of course, had long been in the President's mind and had no connection with the utterances of the German Chancellor. Germany replied, declining to state terms and proposing direct negotiations. On January 13, 1917, England and France complied with the suggestion of the President and stated their terms.

Germany's insincerity was made clear. She was posing as a victor and wished to enter into peace negotiations only provided she was regarded as a victor and on the basis of her retention of conquered possessions. Previously her preparations, including her submarine fleet, had not been matured. She drew the negotiations out interminably to gain time. It was also now made obvious that her aim in proposing peace was to create a favorable attitude among certain parts of

the American people, to throw the responsibility on the Allies for prolonging the war, and to lay a predicate for her policy of submarine ruthlessness.

On January 31, on the pretext of acknowledging receipt of the President's address to the Senate, Germany expressed regret that the attitude of the Allies, their lust for conquest, made peace impossible. This, she proclaimed, created a new situation, to which reference was made in a former note, and called for a decision. That decision was nothing less than to violate all her solemn pledges, to extend the submarine zone to Great Britain, France, and Italy, and to sink all ships. She was confident that this action would lead to a speedy termination of the war and would be understood by the United States. As a favor to this country she would permit it to send one steamer a week each way to a particular port, Falmouth. She fixed the day for arrival, Sunday, and the day for departure, Wednesday. The ship must be striped with three stripes each a meter wide, white and red alternating, and a guaranty must be given that it carry no contraband.

The President promptly executed his warning to Germany, severing diplomatic relations with the German Empire on February 3. Immediately the President laid the matter before Congress and informed it of his action. American ships, however, remained in port as they arrived, as did those of other neutrals, and Germany was achieving her ends by menace. On the same day the *Houstonic,* an American steamer, was sunk, and on February 13 the *Lyman M. Law.* It was obvious that a further step must be taken or this country would be impotent and would be playing into the hands of the Prussian autocrats. Therefore, on February 26 the President asked Congress for authority to arm merchant vessels and even then said that war, if it came, could come only by the act of Germany.

In the period from February 26 to April 2, six American ships were sunk with loss of many lives. Ships of other neutrals were destroyed and Americans were murdered. In this whole period, 226 American citizens, many of them women and children, were killed. Armed neutrality obviously was ineffective. The country was experiencing all the disadvantages of war without any of the rights or effectiveness of a belligerent. Only one alternative was left.

On April 2 the President appeared before Congress and recommended that a state of war be declared against the Ger-

man Government. The Congress accepted the recommendation by a vote of 373 to 50 in the House of Representatives and 82 to 6 in the Senate.

If we had not accepted the challenge of the war-mad, desperate, dictatorial, contemptuous, hypocritical, and medieval Prussian militarists, we would have had to admit that we were not a free nation, that we preferred peace at any price and were interested only in the fleshpots. This country either had to swallow its own words, abdicate its position as a free sovereign power, concede that it had no rights except those which Germany accorded it, hold its citizens and ships away from Europe, or to recognize the plain fact that Germany was acting in a hostile manner against it, fight to defend its rights, fight for humanity and the cause of civilization and free peoples everywhere, joining its power with the other free nations of the world to put an end to autocratic and brute force. There was one choice we could not make—we were incapable of making. We could not "choose the path of submission and suffer the most sacred rights of our Nation and our people to be ignored or violated."

Does not this review make it plain what it would mean to the world if Germany should win and if free, democratic, law-supporting nations like Great Britain and France were destroyed, if Europe should fall under the domination of Germany, headed by the Prussian military autocrats who know no right except might, who believe that small and peace-loving nations have no standing, and who attach no sanctity to a pledge, no matter how solemn? If Prussian militarism should be permitted to dominate, then the Anglo-Saxon fight for free institutions and liberty, persisting from Runnymede to Yorktown, its fight against the absolute rights of kings and barons, with its Magna Charta, its Bill of Rights, its Declaration of Independence, and the heroic fight of the French people for liberty, would have been made in vain. Has it not become patent that Prussia is the last great stronghold of feudal absolutism; that in fighting Prussian autocracy the modern nations are truly assisting the Germans, who are only in part conscious of their servitude, to gain what England, France, and America have had for generations; and that we are surely finally about to make the world safe for democracy and humanity?

THE PRUSSIAN MILITARY AUTOCRACY.

WHAT IS this Prussian military autocracy against which is arrayed four-fifths of the world? How has such an influence persisted in a nation which many have regarded as foremost in science, in sociology, and in some respects in community living? Does it really exist? Many Americans find difficulty in believing that there is such a force today in Germany. This is natural. They have for the most part until recently thought almost exclusively in terms of German art, education, science, including medicine, and industry. For many generations Americans went to school in Germany. German university training was considered almost a prerequisite for academic advancement. German industry was known to be making giant strides. Germany was assumed to stand for the maximum of efficiency in everything. It was the home of science, the final expression of modernism.

In respect to all these things the world's impressions contained a large amount of error. Germany has never been supreme in science. In discovery, in creative science, and in invention she has lagged behind England and France and has been inferior to this country. Her peculiar merit has been that she has made a system of science, organized it back of industry and especially back of those industries which are fundamental to military pursuits, and has applied it intelligently and persistently. Especially in applied chemistry has her achievement been marked. In industry her chief performance has been to organize it through every possible form of state aid or support. Prussia in particular has been highly organized at the top. She is really a great public corporation for military and industrial purposes. She is a feudal estate writ large and, as such, well administered. She has been over-organized and organized on an unsound basis; and there is truth in the assertion that much of her dissatisfaction with pre-war conditions was due to the unwholesomeness of her economic situation. In a measure she was trying to lift herself by her bootstraps. She was strong at the top

and weak at the bottom. Taking it by and large, Prussia is not and never has been as efficient as the United States or Great Britain. These have been insufficiently organized at the top, but they have been immensely strong in their foundations; and what organization they have had has been in the main for peace and not for war.

Americans, even those who travel and read much, have not concerned themselves deeply about foreign political institutions. They have taken note of what lay on the surface and have not always carefully examined it. They have observed that German cities are orderly and clean, that Germany is a confederation, and that suffrage for the Reichstag is universal. It was not unnatural for them hastily to assume that German institutions are modern, as her science is, and that they were therefore democratic. It is not uncommon for people to be deceived by names and appearances, especially in politics.

To understand Germany politically we must examine her history and fix our attention on Prussia. There are two Germanies today: Modern Germany, Germany of the masses, kindly, orderly, and industrious; political Germany, governmental Germany, medieval, absolutist, militarist, aggressive. The latter is passing; the former is the Germany of tomorrow.

About the time of the discovery of America, the Hohenzollern family ruled over an insignificant tract surrounding the village of Berlin. In 1611, its power was extended by the union of the Mark of Brandenburg and the Duchy of Prussia. In 1640 a strong character, Frederick William, came into power. He exercised despotic rule, but put his house in order and developed a relatively strong standing army with which to make further headway by force as opportunity might offer. In 1688, the date of the Restoration in England, and the beginning of her orderly constitutional government, Frederick the Third, an ambitious individual, became head of the house. His title was Elector of Brandenburg and Duke of Prussia. He was anxious for recognition—for the title of king. The War of Spanish Succession was about to begin. His overlord, the Holy Roman Emperor, needed assistance. Frederick was prepared to trade and promised the aid of his army in exchange for the title of Elector of Brandenburg and King of Prussia. This he secured in 1701. Here was the first phase of the contact with Austria, the last of which is seen

in our own day in the complete subordination of Austrian to Prussian influence.

In 1713 a violent, brutish person, Frederick William the First, began to reign. Like his ancestors, he kept his eye on the main chance, husbanded his resources, and added to his army, which at his death numbered 80,000, an immense trained force for that day and time. He, too, was ready by force to add to his patrimony at the expense of any convenient neighbor. It was left to his successor to make use of what he had prepared. In 1740 the Emperor of Austria, Charles the Sixth, the last of the male line of Hapsburgs, died. He had bound the leading powers by solemn pledge to recognize as his successor his daughter, Maria Theresa. Frederick, the Great Frederick, promptly gave Maria Theresa strong assurance of friendship and support, having it in mind at the very time to commit a crime against her. He suddenly moved his army against her province of Silesia, and after eight years of desperate warfare appropriated it. He at least made no pretense of virtue, and is reported to have said: "Ambition, interest, and the desire of making people talk about me carried the day and I decided for war."

Prussia was defeated and humiliated by Napoleon in a quick campaign in 1806, but the liberal movements of the period scarcely affected her. She bided her time and laid her plans. Her next considerable advance was made in 1864, when she induced Austria to join her in taking Schleswig and Holstein from Denmark. Austria received Holstein; and in 1866 Prussia picked a quarrel with her and quickly vanquished her, appropriating Holstein and annexing Hanover, Hesse, Nassau, and Frankfort, which had taken sides with Austria. Thus she rounded out her territory. When the Prussian Parliament protested that force was not a sufficient justification for what had been done to Denmark, Bismarck replied: "Our right is the right of the German nation to exist, to breathe, to unite." The claim of a place in the sun, the doctrine of necessity, and the right of might are not of recent appearance in Prussian history. They have been the outstanding characteristics of her thinking and practice since she emerged from medieval obscurity.

The next step was the crushing of France in 1870–71, the annexation of Alsace-Lorraine, and the imposition of Prussian leadership on Germany under the guise of a confederation.

No wonder Bernhardi wrote: "The lessons of history confirm the view that wars which have been deliberately provoked by far-seeing statesmen have had the happiest results." No wonder Prussia believes that a great army is the cornerstone of her well-being as a nation and that war is a positive good if it succeeds.

So Prussia has come to dominate Germany. She now seeks to dominate the whole of Central Europe and a part of Asia; and if she gains what she wants in this war, she will persistently lay her plans for the next great aggressive move.

Prussia is Germany. She has three-fifths the area and five-eighths the population. The German Empire is a federation only in name. Bismarck's aim was to make Prussia supreme in Germany and Germany supreme in Europe. He knew how to do the job. This is the underlying fact: Prussia is Germany, and Prussia politically is feudal. In such a system sovereignty is the private right of rulers. The prince may deal with his people as private individuals do with their lands. Recently we had a clear practical illustration of this in Germany. The ruler of Waldeck got into debt. He could not raise the money to equip his army. He therefore sold his rights, his possessions, and his peoples to the King of Prussia and went to Italy to live on his income. The people exist for the government and not the government for the people. Frederick William was not joking when he wrote: "Salvation belongs to the Lord and everything else is my affair"; or again, "We are lord and king and can do what we will." Neither was the present Kaiser when he asserted: "We Hohenzollerns take our crown from God alone and to God alone are we responsible in the fulfillment of our duty." He was simply revealing the true inwardness of his royal medieval mind and of Prussian politics, speaking from the background of centuries of feudal traditions. Prussia is a feudal state. It practices paternalism on a large scale in this modern day as did the Duchy of Prussia on a small scale centuries ago. It asserts the divine right of the king and of aristocrats to rule.

Prussian governmental arrangements today of all grades are the legal expression of the economic interests and domination of the large landowners and of their recent allies, the great industrial leaders. Feudal estates still persist in the kingdom, with their principal strongholds in East Prussia,

Posen, and Pomerania. In Prussia 31 per cent of the land is in estates of over 250 acres, large holdings for Central and Western Europe; in Posen 55 per cent and in Pomerania 52 per cent. The average size of 8,365 estates in East Prussia is 1,132 acres; of 2,793 in Pomerania, 1,380 acres. Many of these are very large and are owned by descendants of feudal lords. The great landholder, the junker, is an individualist, independent, militaristic, conservative, in favor of armed strength, condescending to inferiors, with a feeling for power, and with the instincts of a soldier, a supporter of monarchy as long as monarchy has a strong arm and supports him and his interests. At first the junker fought the new industrial class, but a reconciliation was effected, and recently the powerful leaders of the two classes have cooperated. The caste system prevails everywhere. Society is stratified and the individual in each stratum is trained for his duties in his particular sphere. Education and society, as well as the army, are organized on this basis; and there is no small truth in the witticism that "every Prussian is satisfied because he has somebody below him to kick." Royalty, the junkers, and the great industrial leaders run Prussia, and Prussia runs Germany.

"But," it may be asked, "how can this be? The Reichstag is the popular house of the Imperial Parliament, and its members are elected by universal suffrage. Is this not conclusive evidence of popular participation and control?" Let us see. In the first place, the electoral districts for the Reichstag have not been changed since they were formed in 1871 when Germany was dominantly agricultural, rural. The great increase in population has been in the cities, and these are the homes of the Liberalists and Radicals. It would have been dangerous to change the districts. This would have given the Liberals and Radicals full representation. Today Berlin should have at least twenty representatives, and elects only eight. The number of voters in agricultural districts equal to those of Berlin returned forty-eight members. In 1907 twenty seats were won by the Conservatives with an average vote of 10,500, and six by Socialists with an average vote of 77,500. The average vote for all Socialist members was 67,000 and for all Conservatives 25,680. The significance of this can readily be seen when it is stated that out of 12,260,000 votes cast in 1912, 1,662,000 were National Liberal, 1,996,000 represented the

strength of the Center party, 1,126,000 that of the Conservative, and 5,750,000 that of the Socialist and Radical parties.

But in reality this makes very little difference. The Reichstag is little more than a debating society. It was intended to be nothing more, to be a "sop" to the progressives. Its powers are great on paper, but exceedingly small in reality. It has the constitutional function of passing on the budget, but the principal revenue laws are permanent. The Reichstag can neither increase nor decrease the schedules, nor make any change in the existing situation unless the King of Prussia wishes it. This comes about in this way: The Bundesrath is the upper house of the Imperial Parliament. Its members are delegates from the various states, representing several state governments and not the people. They vote according to instructions, and one member may cast the vote for any delegation. Fourteen members can defeat any measure, and the Government of Prussia—that is, the King of Prussia—controls twenty votes.

The Reichstag does not really initiate legislation. Important measures are first discussed in the Bundesrath, then they go to the Reichstag, and back to the Bundesrath for approval. The initiative for the most part comes from the Chancellor, who is also Prime Minister of Prussia. The ruler, as Emperor, may instruct the Chancellor to prepare a measure, as King he may order him to introduce it and may direct amendments to be made and prevent changes. As Emperor he may promulgate the law, and as King he administers it in Prussia. There is no imperial cabinet. The Chancellor is the only minister. The other heads of departments act independently of each other but under the supervision of the Chancellor. The Chancellor is not in the slightest degree responsible to Parliament or to the people, but solely to the Emperor, and this by reason of the fact that he is also Prime Minister of Prussia and represents the King of Prussia in the Bundesrath. When von Bethmann-Hollweg became Chancellor he emphasized this fact, asserting "I do not serve Parliament," adding that he would not play the rôle of servant of the people's representatives. The Chancellor does not sit in the Reichstag as such, but as Prussian delegate to the Bundesrath, all members of which have a right to sit in the lower house and there to support their measures.

Of the 397 members of the Reichstag, Prussia sends 236. The body can be dissolved at any time by the Bundesrath, with the consent of the Emperor. This power has been used effectively three times to break down the resistance of the Reichstag; in 1878, when it refused to pass the bill to suppress the Socialists; in 1887, when it would not agree to fix the size of the army for seven years; and in 1893, when it declined to change the military system. In each case the new body did what the government demanded. Since the principal financial arrangements are matters of standing law, if the Reichstag refuses to pass a new budget increasing allowances, or passes one reducing them, the government can be carried on on the old basis without any action on the part of Parliament. We find a parallel for this in English history in the days of the Stuarts.

The upper house, the Bundesrath, consists of 61 instructed delegates, usually officers of state, frequently ministers, voting under instruction and appointed without fixed tenure. Of this number, Prussia controls twenty. This body and the King of Prussia dominate the Reichstag.

By the constitution, the presidency of the confederation belongs to the King of Prussia. He appoints the Chancellor and most other officers, directs foreign affairs, commands the army and navy of the whole empire, inspects and disposes of troops, appoints all officers whose commands include the contingent of the state, and the selection of all general officers is subject to his approval. Prussian military regulations are enforced throughout the empire. The Emperor declares defensive war, and there is no authority to determine what war is defensive and what offensive. Bismarck's principal aim was to create a powerful military state. All the world knows how well he succeeded.

Many of the foregoing important direct powers belong to the Emperor. Obviously larger powers accrue to him by virtue of the fact that he is King of Prussia and that Prussia is Germany. The Emperor, as such, has no material rights in legislation, no authority to appoint or to disapprove laws, yet he constantly does these things. He has no power to issue decrees, yet here also, says Zorn, the German publicist, "The monarchical principle, without legal provisions, and indeed contrary to them, has forced recognition. * * * We, Wilhelm, by grace of God, German Emperor, order with the con-

sent of the Bundesrath." Again Zorn says, "The inspiring forces of the world's history and the magnitude of his actual power have given the Emperor a position wholly different from what was legally intended and places him on a par with monarchical emperors—we see how formally inspired and even constitutional provisions lose their force in face of the constraining necessities of national life." So the Prussianizing of Germany is complete. There is normally a higher law in Germany than the constitution. That law is the law of necessity or might.

Let us take a more intimate view of Prussia and ascertain what are the arrangements of this dominant member, what chance is afforded the people for expression. Take her Parliament, the Landtag. What does it represent? Is there a government responsible to the people? The Landtag has two chambers, the house of lords and lower house. The former is a medieval body composed of princes of royal blood, members who are independent princes of the Holy Roman Empire or hereditary members designated at will by the King, and others designated by him at will or on nomination of landholders. The King can control it at any time by appointing new members. It now has a membership of 300, one-third hereditary nobles with large estates—junkers—and one-third dominated by landholders—junkers. It is a class assembly, far removed from the people.

The lower house is composed of members elected indirectly by an electoral body. One member is selected in each district. The electoral body is selected in this fashion: One-third of it is designated by the large taxpayers who pay the first third of the taxes, one-third by those who pay the second third of the taxes, and the remainder by the rest of the voters. From three to five per cent of the voters choose one-third of the electors; from ten to twelve per cent a third, or about fifteen per cent of the voters choose 213 of the electors. In 2,200 districts one man selects a third of the electors. In 1908 the number of votes cast was 2,215,000. The Social Democrats, with 601,000 votes, elected seven members. They should have secured 105. The Conservatives, with 356,000 votes, elected 152. They were entitled to 62. The Clericals, with 502,000 votes, won 104 seats, instead of 88, their proper number. The Liberal party secured 28 instead of 40. In East Prussia the number of inhabitants to a representative was

63,000; in Berlin 170,000. Berlin secured nine votes and should have had 24. One-fourth the population in agricultural districts selected 161 members; one-fourth in the cities elected 41. Remember, too, that the ballot is not secret and that pressure is consistently brought to bear on the lower-class voter. The municipal councils are selected in the same way. The classes rule.

The province is the highest subdivision of Prussia. Its chief executive is appointed by the King. Its legislative body is not elected by the people but by legislative bodies of the next lowest subdivisions, the circles and the municipalities. The president may veto the action of the body if it goes beyond its jurisdiction. Its measures must be approved by the King, who may dissolve it at will.

The circle is the chief local subdivision. Its principal administrative officer is appointed by the president of the province. The members of its legislative body, the Kreistag, are divided between the cities and the rural districts, not more than one-half to the cities. The members assigned to the cities are not elected directly by the people but by the municipal assemblies, which represent property. The rural members are divided into two equal groups: The great landowner and large taxpayer of the rural community elect half; the other half are elected indirectly by a body composed (1) of those who pay a small tax, (2) of proprietors of manors, and (3) of electors selected by rural communal assemblies. To be a voter even for one of these electors who shares the doubtful privilege of joining larger taxpayers and owners of medieval manors in selecting half the rural members of the local assembly the other half of which is controlled absolutely by wealth, the individual himself must be a small taxpayer. This is certainly placing the individual, the man, politically at the vanishing point.

There is no manhood suffrage in Prussia, in Germany, where it counts for anything. It does not count for anything so far as the Reichstag is concerned. Evidently in Prussia it is non-existent. Landowners and men of industrial standing are strongly intrenched. They have dug themselves in and made their administrative and legislative trenches of reinforced concrete. The junker is not only on top; he is pyramided. Autocracy, absolutism, is supreme.

Granted that the ruling class does its paternalistic job for the people as well as such a job can be done by a few for the

many, at best it must be inadequately done; for no part of the people can understand the needs of all the people and satisfy them as well as all the people can. Granted, I say, that the job, for a paternalistic job, is well done, still the essential nature of the régime is unsound, unmodern, medieval and out of tune with modern tendencies. This governing class, believing in expansion by armed force, provoked war, violated the neutrality of Belgium, directed the submarine campaign, sweeping aside international law and custom built up through the centuries, sinking great passenger and freight vessels like the *Lusitania,* the *Arabic,* and *Sussex,* slaughtering women and children. It ordered the deportation of Belgian civilians, planned and executed the campaign of spying and violence in this and other neutral countries, and directed the submarine negotiations with all its evasions, cynicism, and duplicity, again and again making solemn promises, constantly violating them, and finally brazenly breaking their most solemn pledge to a great, patient, peaceful power. These people entertain the medieval notion that one nation's prosperity is another nation's menace, that it is to the interest and happiness of one nation to dominate other peoples and areas, and that small nations have no rights which strong nations need to protect and have no justification for existence.

The President told us that for a little while he was unable to believe that such things would in fact be done by any government as have been done by Germany during this war. It was difficult for the American people to credit it. It is yet difficult to believe that the great masses of the German people, if they were fully informed, would sanction it. It is only through a knowledge of the character and medieval ideals of the few who dominate Prussia and Germany that we can begin to understand it. With such information, was can more easily appreciate what was in the President's mind when he said, "We have no quarrel with the German people. * * * It was not upon their impulse that their government acted in entering the war. It was not with their previous knowledge or approval. It was a war determined upon as wars used to be determined upon in the old unhappy days when peoples nowhere were consulted by their rulers and wars were provoked and waged in the interests of dynasties or by little groups of ambitious men who were accustomed to use their fellowmen as tools. * * * A steadfast concert for peace can never be

ned except by a partnership of democratic nations. No ...ratic government could be trusted to keep faith within and to observe its covenants. * * * We are accepting this challenge of hostile purposes because we know that in such a government following such methods we can never have a friend; and that in the presence of its organized power, always lying in wait to accomplish we know not what purpose, there can be no assured security for the democratic governments of the world. We are now about to accept the gage of battle with the natural foe of liberty and shall, if necessary, spend the whole force of the nation to check and nullify its pretensions and power. We are glad now that we see the facts with no veil of false pretenses about them, to fight thus for the ultimate peace of the world and for the liberty of its peoples, the German people included; for the rights of nations great and small and the privilege of men everywhere to choose their way of living and obedience." Was he not clearly right when he asserted in his answer to His Holiness the Pope: "We cannot take the word of the present rulers of Germany as a guaranty of anything that is to endure unless explicitly supported by such conclusive evidence of the will and purpose of the German people themselves as the other peoples of the world would be justified in accepting. Without such guaranties, treaties of settlement, agreements for disarmament, covenants to set up arbitration in the place of force, territorial adjustments, reconstitutions of small nations, if made with the German Government, no man, no nation can depend on. We must await some new evidence of the purposes of the great peoples of the Central Powers."

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS
0 021 929 097 4

WE ARE AT WAR—

Because Germany made war on us, sunk our ships, and killed our citizens.

To assert and to defend our rights.

To make good our claim that we are a free nation.

To have the kind of institutions we wish.

To live the kind of life we have determined to live.

—Secretary Houston.

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS
0 021 929 097 4